A Personal Monitoring Study to Assess Workplace Exposure to Environmental Tobacco Smoke

David B. Coultas, MD, Jonathan M. Samet, MD, John F. McCarthy, ScD, and John D. Spengler, PhD

Abstract: We enrolled 15 nonsmoking volunteers to evaluate the feasibility of measuring personal exposure to environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) at work and to characterize workplace exposures. During one workshift, we obtained questionnaires on exposure, saliva and urine for cotinine, and personal air samples for respirable particles and nicotine. The levels of cotinine, respirable particles, and nicotine varied widely with self-reports of exposure to ETS, but on average increased with increasing exposure. (*Am J Public Health* 1990; 80:988–990.)

Introduction

While health effects of passive smoking on children and adults have been identified, the principal location of exposure investigated has been the home.[1,2] Workplace exposure has received less attention, and health effects of environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) in the workplace remain controversial.

We enrolled 15 nonsmoking adults to determine the feasibility of measuring personal exposure to ETS at work and to characterize workplace exposures of this small group of subjects. Indicators of exposure, measured during a workday, included questionnaires, personal samples for respirable particles (RSP) and nicotine, and urinary and salivary cotinine.

Methods

Between October 1986 and May 1987, 15 nonsmoking volunteers (eight men, seven women), 18 years of age and older, were recruited from the Albuquerque, New Mexico area. We obtained exposure questionnaires, saliva, urine, and personal air particle samples during one workshift. The saliva and urine specimens were obtained before and after the workshift. Cotinine was quantitated by a double antibody radioimmunoassay, as described by Langone, *et al.*[3] Details of the assay in our laboratory have been reported previously.[4]

During the workshift, each subject wore a personal monitoring pump running at 1.7 l/min with a 10 mm nylon cyclone clipped to the shirt collar.[5] RSP samples were collected on 37 mm Fluropore filters (Millipore Corp). Nicotine was collected on a glass fiber backup filter treated with sodium bisulfate to minimize volatilization; after extraction from the filter, analysis for nicotine was done on a gas chromatograph with a flame ionization detector.[6] The recovery of nicotine by this procedure has been shown to be 98 percent efficient.

From the questionnaires, we derived measures of exposure including the total number of cigarette smokers and total number of hours exposed during the workshift. To describe the relationships among the measures of ETS exposure, Spearman correlations were calculated. Data analysis was performed with standard programs.[7]

Results

Occupations of the subjects were diverse (Table 1); mean age was 44.8 years; average duration of the workshift and of the personal monitoring was 6.5 hours (SD ± 2.0).

Exposure to cigarette smokers at work was reported by 13 of the 15 participants. Of the 13 reporting exposure, two reported exposure to crowds of smokers during their workshift and the remaining 11 encountered a mean of 8.8 smokers (SD ± 6.7). The mean reported hours of exposure was 3.4 (SD ± 2.1).

Respirable particle and nicotine concentrations varied widely with the reported number of smokers and hours of exposure. The mean concentrations for RSP and nicotine were 63.9 $\mu g/m^3$ (SD ± 41.5) and 20.4 $\mu g/m^3$ (SD ± 20.6), respectively. Correlations between the atmospheric markers

From the New Mexico Tumor Registry, Cancer Center (Coultas, Samet) and the Department of Environmental Science Engineering, Harvard School of Public Health (McCarthy, Spengler).

Address reprint requests to David B. Coultas, MD, Assistant Professor of Medicine, University of New Mexico Medical Center, New Mexico Tumor Registry, 900 Camino de Salud NE, Albuquerque, NM 87131. This paper, submitted to the Journal July 31, 1989, was revised and accepted for publication January 18, 1990.

TABLE 1—Description of Participants in a Personal Monitoring Study of Exposure to Environmental Tobacco Smoke at Work, New Mexico, 1986–87

Occupation/Workplace	Workshift Duration/ Exposure Duration (hours)	RSP ($\mu g/m^3$)	Nicotine ($\mu g/m^3$)
Males			
Physician/Hospital	8/5	52.3	10.0
Social Worker/Office	8/0	44.0	2.5
Stock Broker/Office	8/2	69.4	7.2
Bus Boy/Restaurant	8/8	145.8	45.0
Maintenance Worker/Retail Store	8/3	85.2	8.9
Barber/Barber Shop	8/0	14.7	4.0
Barber/Barber Shop	8/4	145.8	13.7
Volunteer/Hospital	4/2	80.0	46.0
Females			
Interviewer/Public Transportation	3/2	4.6	0.0
Travel Agent/Office	8/8	85.7	56.0
Travel Agent/Office	8/4	62.1	46.7
Attorney/Office	8/6	83.3	5.9
Volunteer/Hospital	4/3	27.6	6.3
Volunteer/Hospital	4/3	25.2	8.7
Volunteer/Hospital	4/4	53.2	53.2

and the questionnaire measures of exposure to ETS were moderate (Table 2).

As was observed for the atmospheric markers, the post-workshift urinary and salivary cotinine levels varied widely with self-reported exposure. In comparison with pre-workshift levels, post-workshift levels were not consistently increased. The mean pre-workshift urinary and salivary cotinine concentrations were 31.8 ng/mg Cr (SD ± 67.6) and 2.9 ng/ml (SD ± 5.0), respectively. For the post-workshift levels, the corresponding values were 19.7 ng/mg Cr (SD ± 43.2) and 3.5 ng/ml (SD ± 5.9).

Spearman correlation coefficients were calculated to examine the relations among the questionnaire variables, the atmospheric markers, and urinary and salivary cotinine (Table 2). Moderate correlations were obtained for self-reports and cotinine levels, and nicotine levels and cotinine levels. However, RSP levels and cotinine concentrations were not correlated.

TABLE 2—Spearman Correlations between Various Measures of Environmental Tobacco Smoke at Work, New Mexico, 1986–87

Correlated Measures	N	r
RSP ($\mu g/m^3$) with:		
Nicotine	15	0.57*
Total number of smokers	15	0.44
Total hours of exposure	15	0.53*
Postshift urinary cotinine	14	0.05
Postshift salivary cotinine	11	−0.07
Nicotine ($\mu g/m^3$) with:		
Total number of smokers	15	0.62*
Total hours of exposure	15	0.54*
Postshift urinary cotinine	14	0.60*
Postshift salivary cotinine	11	0.46
Postshift urinary cotinine (ng/mg Cr) with:		
Total number of smokers	14	0.39
Total hours of exposure	14	0.57*
Postshift salivary cotinine (ng/ml) with:		
Total number of smokers	11	0.63*
Total hours of exposure	11	0.45

*$p < 0.05$

Discussion

The controversial effects of involuntary smoking in the workplace need further investigation. The conduct of such research would be facilitated by the development of unintrusive and accurate methods of exposure assessment. Alternative approaches include active and passive monitoring, biological markers, and questionnaires. We have shown that personal monitoring for tobacco smoke components can be accomplished in the workplace. However, many employers and employees would not participate in the study because of concern about the wearing of pumps.

Despite the small number of subjects studied in this investigation, objective evidence of exposure to ETS was obtained in various workplaces. The levels of RSP and nicotine were similar to those observed in other investigations.[6,8–10] However, few of these studies included information on the intensity and duration of exposure to ETS.[10]

We observed moderate positive correlations among the questionnaire measures of ETS exposure, the results of personal monitoring for RSP and nicotine, and measurements of urinary cotinine. Each of these types of measures provides a differing index of exposure to ETS.[1] The questionnaire measures that were used assess source strength, but concentrations of ETS are also influenced by room volume and ventilation. Nicotine is a specific marker of exposure to ETS, whereas RSP is nonspecific. Cotinine levels reflect nicotine exposure, but also are determined by timing of specimen collection[10] and uptake and metabolism. Thus, tight concordance among these broad indicators of exposure used in this study would not be anticipated.

Because of the differing characteristics of questionnaires, personal monitoring, and biological markers for assessing ETS exposure, no single method should be considered as optimal for studying the workplace. We recommend that assessment of ETS exposure in indoor environments should utilize multiple approaches to characterize short- and long-term exposures. In population studies, questionnaire measures of exposure offer the simplest approach with personal atmospheric markers and biologic markers providing methods for estimating the potential magnitude of misclassification of self-reported exposure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Dr. Helen Van Vunakis for providing the reagents for the radioimmunoassay and Irene Walkiw for technical assistance in performing the assays.

Supported by a cooperative agreement, EPA CR811650, from the US Environmental Protection Agency. Dr. Coultas is recipient of an Edward Livingston Trudeau Scholar Award from the American Lung Association. Presented in part at Indoor Air Quality '89, sponsored by the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers and the Society for Occupational and Environmental Health, April 1989.

REFERENCES

1. US Department of Health and Human Services: The Health Consequences of Involuntary Smoking: A Report of the Surgeon General. (DHHS [CDC] pub. no. 87-8398). Rockville, MD: US Public Health Service, 1986.
2. National Research Council: Environmental Tobacco Smoke. Measuring Exposures and Assessing Health Effects. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1986.
3. Langone JJ, Gjika HB, Van Vunakis H: Nicotine and its metabolites. Radioimmunoassays for nicotine and cotinine. Biochemistry 1973; 12:5025–5030.
4. Coultas DB, Howard CA, Peake GT, Skipper BJ, Samet JM: Salivary cotinine levels and involuntary tobacco smoke exposure in children and adults in New Mexico. Am Rev Respir Dis 1987; 136:305–309.

5. Turner WA, Spengler JD, Dockery DW, Colome SD: Design and performance of a reliable monitoring system for respirable particulates. J Air Pollut Control Assoc 1979; 29:747–748.
6. Hammond SK, Leaderer BP, Roche AC, Schenker M: Collection and analysis of nicotine as a marker for environmental tobacco smoke. Atmospher Environ 1987; 21:457–462.
7. SAS Institute, Inc: SAS User's Guide: Statistics. Version 5 edition. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc. 1985.
8. Spengler JD, Treitman RD, Tosteson TD, Mage DT, Soczek ML: Personal exposure to respirable particulates and implications for air pollution epidemiology. Environ Sci Technol 1985; 19:700–707.
9. Muramatsu M, Umemura S, Okada T, Tomita H: Estimation of personal exposure to tobacco smoke with a newly developed nicotine personal monitor. Environ Res 1984; 35:218–227.
10. Mattson ME, Boyd G, Byar D, Brown C, Callahan JF, Corle D, Cullen JW, Greenblatt J, Haley NJ, Hammond K, Lewtas J, Reeves W: Passive smoking on commercial airline flights. JAMA 1989; 261:867–872.